

May 22, 1985

bogged down just like we are now. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Senator Abboud, you are next on the list, and then Senator Goodrich.

SENATOR ABOUD: Mr. President, colleagues, I'd like to rise and say at first that I don't believe there is a harder working committee than the Appropriations Committee is. I think they put in long hours. Since the beginning of the session they've been out working late at night, they've been coming in here on the weekends. I think they've done a commendable job of taking a close look at the budget. I think from what they've had to deal with they've done a fantastic job. But I do have one question for Senator Warner, if he would yield to a question, Mr. President. Would Senator Warner yield to a question?

PRESIDENT: Senator Warner is available. May we have order in the Chamber, please so we may follow the discussion.

SENATOR ABOUD: Senator Warner, Senator Warner, Senator Beutler's amendment will cut approximately \$4 million to \$15 million from the budget. Is it the goal of the Appropriations Committee that this will be the amount that will be cut when you come back here in three days? Will this be the figure that you will be striving for so that we can avert a tax increase this year of the sales and income tax?

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Abboud, as I indicated earlier, I can only answer you as to what I heard said because there was not a target figure discussed. So I can't report to you a target figure. Obviously, however, obviously there is no point in doing it unless it is done for the reason of reducing that amount or more. The criteria that we want to use, as I indicated, is identify a series of possible eliminations that have some rationale to it, that has some balance to it, to provide to the Legislature as a whole, which will be permanent cuts. I know of no way that you are going to avoid the tax problem, in my own opinion. I'm not speaking for the committee. I know of no way that you are going to avoid a tax problem with some of the solutions that we discussed, because they are backing it all into next year. If you are serious about reducing the scope of government, which is the way you reduce the cost of government permanently, then we have no choice but to do the